



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,470	07/24/2003	John Reynders	9692-000033	1293
27572	7590	01/20/2006	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			MIZRAHI, DIANE D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2165	

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,470	REYNDERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DIANE D. MIZRAHI	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

III. DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21 are presented for examination and are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC . 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to a non-statutory subject matter, specifically, the claims are not directed towards the final result that is "useful, tangible and concrete.

(See State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74 USPQ2d at 1601-02).

According to the New Guidelines of October 26, 2005, which states that "A claim limited to a machine or manufacture, which has a practical application, is statutory. In most cases a claim to a specific machine or manufacture will have a practical application. See Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557) ... a specific machine to produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result and State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74 USPQ2d at 1601-02).

(Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility
<http://rs6.net/tn.jsp?t=mdmd7pbab.0.kbg76pbab.p9qiibab.7440&p=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.uspto.gov%2Fweb%2Foffices%2Fpac%2Fdapp%2Fopla%2Fpreognote%2Fguidelines101_20051026.pdf>)

Claims 4-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to a non-statutory subject matter, specifically, directed towards a data structure.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that abstractions are not patentable. "An idea of itself is not patentable". Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard, 20 Wall. 498, 07. Phenomena of nature, though just discovered, mental processes, abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable, as they are the basic tools of scientific and technological work Gottschalk v. Benson, 175 USPQ 673, 675 (S Ct 1972). It is a common place that laws of nature, physical phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable subject matter Parker v. Flook, 197 USPQ 193, 201 (S Ct 1978). A process that consists solely of the manipulation of a data structure is not concrete or tangible. See In re Warmerdam, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also Schrader, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459.

Claims 4-13 represents a data structure that does not provide a practical application in the technological arts. There is no manipulation of data nor is there any transformation of data from one state to another state being performed in "a knowledge management data structure... ". Actually, no post-computer process activity is found in the technological arts.

"a knowledge management data structure..." is not a physical transformation. Thus, no physical transformation is performed, no practical application is found. Also, the claims do not appear to correspond to a specific machine or manufacture disclosed within the specification and thus encompass any product of the class configured in any manner to perform the underlying process. Consequently, the claims are analyzed based upon the underlying process, and are thus rejected as being directed.

Also, Claims 4-21 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 9, line [0032], the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as intangible embodiments (e.g., [carrier wave]). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Therefore, Examiner believes that the above listed claims are nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paul Scheier et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20020035584 A1 and Scheier hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 1, Scheier teaches managing information used in the drug discovery process comprising: receiving information from a plurality of sources [0056]; [0098]; obtaining a method to verify the integrity of the information [0005]; converting the information to a common format that maintains synchronicity between a data-centric view of said information and a document-centric view of said information [0164]; [0171]; [0084]; inputting the information in said common format to a workflow engine [0003] [0098]; [0156] [0159]; and

receiving one or more outputs of said workflow engine [0053].

Regarding Claim 2, Scheier teaches ... checksum after receiving from said plurality of sources 0101].

Regarding Claim 3, Scheier teaches ... engine performs the following: receiving a workflow comprising a set of user-defined steps for processing information [0098]; receiving a plurality of data required for executing said workflow [0040] [0003]; generating one or more views as specified by said workflow; and publishing said one or more views [0040] [0162].

Regarding Claim 4, the limitations are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. In addition, Scheier teaches audit/version [0101].

Regarding Claim 5, Scheier teaches data object with at least one workflow [0152].

Regarding Claim 6, Scheier ... at least one workflow ... [0152].

Regarding Claim 7, Scheier teaches data object with at least one other data object in a belongs to relationship [0148].

Regarding Claim 8, Scheier teaches data object to a history log [0101].

Regarding Claims 9-10, Scheier teaches history log includes a timestamp indicia associated with said data object [0101].

Regarding Claim 11, this claim is similar in scope to the

rejected claims above and is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding Claim 12, Scheier teaches authentication record associated with data object [0118] [0119].

Regarding Claim 13, Scheier teaches wherein said compliance attribute associates said data object with at least one compliance object having associated compliance requirements [0101] [0104].

Regarding Claims 14-21, the limitations of these claims is similar in scope to the rejected claims above and are therefore rejected as set forth above.

Other Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will not be supplied with Office actions. Examiners advises the Applicant that the cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. For the use of the Office's PAIR system, Applicants may refer to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or

1-866-217-9197.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane D. Mizrahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 305-3900 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Diane Mizrahi
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

January 16, 2005